

I am submitting payment of this \$600 appellate fee, but I must do so while formally lodging a protest on the record.

The manner in which this fee is being extracted from me as an unrepresented litigant simply cannot be divorced from the broader issues of disputable judicial integrity that have irreparably tainted the proceedings in my case up to this point.

By the court's own actions and rulings, it has become unmistakably evident that one of two constitutionally-impermissible circumstances have taken root and functionally compromised the judge's ability to impartially adjudicate my allegations of government misconduct:

Either the judge presiding over my matter has been hopelessly compromised by unethical bias that has caused the systematic dismissal of controlling legal precedents, willful disregard of substantial evidence I provided, and a prioritization of reaching a predetermined conclusion through contorted legal reasoning.

Or alternatively, the judge has demonstrated a complete lack of rudimentary legal reasoning abilities and comprehension of foundational jurisprudential principles - a deficit in basic competency of such magnitude that it is universally disqualifying for judicial service.

I do not make either of those charges lightly. The record itself substantiates that no other plausible rationalization exists for the judge's facially untenable rulings and glaring omissions that simply cannot be reconciled with adherence to evidentiary rules, ethics canons, and binding case law.

So for this court to now demand payment of appellate fees from me absent any good-faith engagement with the merits and legal authorities I have extensively evidenced is little more than an institutionalized shake-down. A flagrant form of fee-churning devoid of due process that prioritizes fiscal tributes over procedural integrity and furtherance of substantive justice.

Thus, while I remit the \$600 payment under protest to preserve my appellate rights, I cannot permit the obvious constitutional deficiencies corroding these proceedings to be monetized away through willful avoidance. Fee obligations premised on proceedings corrupted by violative bias or incompetence are no debts justly owed.

So I reiterate my non-acquiescence and protest. This payment must not be accepted as acquiescence to the court's continued indifference toward rectifying the deficiencies I have extensively documented and argued. A direct ruling on the merits of my substantiated allegations is due - has this judge's ethical misconduct through bias, or lack of legal aptitude, irrevocably contaminated the process?

The court's refusal to squarely rule on, and remediate, whichever transgression has transpired would effectively confirm this institution's role has devolved into enthusiastically enabling injustice through willful dereliction. For a judiciary defiantly insulating itself from accountability to

constitutional principles it was exclusively sworn to uphold represents a full-scale existential invalidation deserving society's most scornful repudiation.

It is important to note that this case has garnered significant public attention and scrutiny, as evidenced by the extensive access records on legal research databases. However, my arguments ultimately stand on their own merits as supported by the evidence, authorities, and legal reasoning presented.

So consider this payment made only provisionally and under vehement protest - one that triggers your constitutional duty to confront my well-pled grievances transparently and dispository. The public's faith in equal justice under law is eroding with each institutionally-calculated avoidance. Provide the ruling and vindication this appeal deserves on its substantive merits, or have your dereliction enshrined as this nation's judicial nadir against which all future actions must be measured.